

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/728,059	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MAURO, SCHIAVON	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kishor Mayekar	<b>Art Unit</b> 1753	

**All Participants:**

(1) Kishor Mayekar.

(2) Thomas Baker.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 11 July 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☐ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2 and 25

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: to emphasize the patentable feature of the claimed invention as the Applicant argued in the remarks filed 3 May 2006 and to clearly distinguish from the prior art references by amending claims 1 and 2 with structure limitations ; and to correct minor informalities in claims 6 and 25 by an examiner's amendment..